

something, and we just kind of go into a rigor and a catatonic state. Then we usually meet, he looking this way, and me looking this way. And I have found in life a very interesting thing; that oftentimes I see something in someone else that might irritate me. And it is most always something I do myself, that I do not handle very well in my own daily doings. With John McCAIN of Arizona, I will just say it takes one to know one. And we do. I commend my friend, and he is going to get a nice vote here. And he is going to be tickled to death. There you are.

Thank you, Madam President.

Mr. McCAIN. Madam President, I thank my friend from Wyoming. He adds to this body in more ways than I am able to describe, especially not the least of which was his brief recitation of his history of his various forms of employment.

I yield the floor, Madam President.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I support raising the Social Security earnings limit to allow Social Security beneficiaries now subject to the limit to earn more income. However, I cannot support the motion to waive the budget point of order on the legislation before the Senate today. Raising the earnings limit will draw increased payments out of the Social Security trust fund. Any measure to raise the earnings limit must pay for that change. The legislation before us does not adequately assure that this will be paid for in a manner which will not increase the Federal deficit or in a manner which avoids further cuts in critical education and health programs, including programs for seniors. I am hopeful that a better manner of paying for this change will be designed and that we will raise the Social Security earnings limit. This one falls short.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion by the Senator from Arizona to waive the point of order. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. LUGAR], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] would vote "nay."

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRADLEY] is absent because of illness in the family.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 53, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 562 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Abraham	Baucus	Biden
Ashcroft	Bennett	Brown

Bryan	Harkin	Murkowski
Burns	Hatch	Nickles
Coats	Heflin	Pressler
Coverdell	Helms	Reid
Craig	Hollings	Roth
D'Amato	Hutchison	Santorum
DeWine	Inhofe	Shelby
Dole	Jeffords	Simon
Faircloth	Kempthorne	Smith
Ford	Kerry	Snowe
Frist	Kyl	Specter
Graham	Lott	Stevens
Gramm	Mack	Thomas
Grams	McCain	Thompson
Grassley	McConnell	Warner
Gregg	Moseley-Braun	

NAYS—42

Akaka	Domenici	Leahy
Bingaman	Dorgan	Levin
Bond	Exon	Lieberman
Boxer	Feingold	Mikulski
Breaux	Feinstein	Moynihan
Bumpers	Glenn	Murray
Byrd	Gorton	Nunn
Campbell	Inouye	Pell
Chafee	Johnston	Pryor
Cochran	Kassebaum	Robb
Cohen	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Conrad	Kerrey	Sarbanes
Daschle	Kohl	Simpson
Dodd	Lautenberg	Wellstone

NOT VOTING—4

Bradley	Lugar
Hatfield	Thurmond

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SANTORUM). On this vote, the yeas are 53, the nays are 42. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is not agreed to. The point of order is well taken, and the bill is committed to the Finance Committee.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, the Senate has spoken at this time. I want the Senate to know that this is an important issue for seniors of America. They are tired of this onerous, unfair, and outrageous tax.

I am sorry my friends across the aisle did not vote for it. They are going to have a chance to vote for it next week, the week after and the week after, and seniors will let their views be known, and others across America, as to how outrageous this vote was. I hope they understand that I am not going to quit on this issue until it is done, because the seniors of America deserve it.

I yield the floor.

(At the request of Mr. DOLE, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

POSITION ON VOTE

• Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent from the Senate today, Thursday, November 2, 1995. During my service in the Senate, I have always taken my duty to represent the people of South Carolina seriously and have been absent from Senate business only when necessary.

With regard to the vote on the motion to waive the Budget Act on S. 1372, the Senior Citizens Freedom to Work Act, I am a strong supporter of increasing the earnings test and would have voted in favor of waiving the Budget Act.●

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I understand and appreciate the concerns of senior citizens about the Social Security earnings limit.

In the past, I have supported increasing the earnings limit for seniors who need to work, but it must be paid for responsibly. Today's proposal raised some questions for me. I was troubled by the effort to further cut domestic discretionary programs.

While cutting domestic discretionary programs sounds simple, cuts of \$9 billion could hurt West Virginia families and even seniors. Many of these programs that would be reduced under this proposal have already been cut severely. Plus the list includes fundamental programs for seniors themselves, like senior nutrition programs and the Low-Income Energy Assistance Program which helps seniors in West Virginia and other northern regions keep the heat on during the winter months. Cutting these programs could easily hurt the seniors that we say we intend to help by raising the earnings limit.

Also, as Senator SIMPSON mentioned in his remarks, it is also difficult to determine what the effect might be of changing interest payments to the Social Security trust fund. Senator McCAIN acknowledged that this aspect of his legislation has not been fully studied, nor was it the focus during previous hearings on the overall issue. When it comes to the long-term solvency of the Social Security trust funds, I firmly believe we must be thoughtful and cautious. Seniors depend upon Social Security, and I want to ensure that they can continue to do so for generations.

I voted for the point of order against Senator McCAIN's legislation because I believe that we must be cautious, consistent, and careful whenever we deal with the Social Security trust fund. Each and every aspect of this proposal should be fully considered by the Senate Finance Committee. We should not rush to judgment. We should not bend the budget rules when it come to Social Security.

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, let me first say I hope the Senator from Arizona will not be discouraged.

I know a few votes would have made a difference, and I think if we can find another way to pay for it, that will pick up additional votes, at least on this side, perhaps on the other side.

I want to make one announcement and a statement.

PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTIONS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I wish to commend the House of Representatives, which yesterday passed a ban on

the use of partial birth abortions by a margin of 288 to 139.

There are many issues which divide reasonable people on both sides of the abortion debate. But use of this procedure, which occurs late in the pregnancy—even in the ninth month—is horrifying to contemplate and completely indefensible.

I believe that people of good will, whatever their views on abortion generally, will agree that it is our obligation to act to defend the defenseless in circumstances where we can. This is one of those circumstances.

Mr. President, earlier this year, Senator SMITH introduced a similar ban on the use of partial birth abortions. It was placed on the Senate calendar under Rule XIV. It is my intention to schedule the House-passed bill for floor consideration at the earliest possible opportunity. I trust the Senate will pass the bill quickly and send it to the President for his signature.

I have little doubt that certainly the President will sign a bill to end this kind of procedure, this kind of practice.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, may we have order in the Senate so we can hear what the majority leader is saying? There are too many conversations going on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The Senate will please come to order. The majority leader.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, we can no longer ignore the fact that teenagers across America are now resorting to illegal drugs in ever-increasing numbers.

The most recent national household survey reveals that marijuana use among teenagers has nearly doubled since 1992, after 13 years of decline. It also reveals that attitudes toward illegal drug use are softening; fewer and fewer teenagers now believe that using illegal drugs is an activity that should be avoided.

Earlier today, the National Parents' Resource Institute for Drug Education [PRIDE], released its own annual survey of drug use by junior and senior high school students. According to the survey, not only are more and more high school students smoking marijuana, they are using it more frequently: one-third of high schools seniors smoked marijuana in the past year and more than 20 percent now smoke it on a monthly basis. The survey also shows that teenage use of hard drugs—cocaine and hallucinogens—is also on the rise. Since 1991, there has been a 36-percent increase in cocaine use by students in grades 9 through 12 and use of hallucinogens has risen a staggering 75 percent since 1988.

Tomorrow, we will probably hear some more disturbing news. If preliminary reports are correct, the Dawn Survey, conducted by the Department of Health and Human Services, will show that emergency-room admissions for drug overdoses are on the increase.

Although then-Governor Clinton boasted during the 1992 Democratic Convention that President Bush

“hasn't fought a real war on crime and drugs * * * [and] I will,” his record in office has not matched his campaign rhetoric. Through neglect and mismanagement, bad policy and misplaced priorities, the Clinton administration has transformed the war on drugs into a full-scale retreat.

Drug interdiction is down. Drug prosecutions are down. The General Accounting Office tells us that the anti-drug effort in the source countries is badly mismanaged. And, perhaps most importantly, the moral bully pulpit has been abandoned.

Regrettably, the administration's most prominent voice on this issue has been a surgeon general who believes the best way to fight illegal drugs is to legalize them.

Obviously, we cannot continue down this path. Failing to control illegal drug use has real-life consequences that affect not only the user but the rest of society. Drugs and violent crime, for example, are inextricably linked. Forty-one percent of all reported AIDS cases are drug-related. Drugs are a major contributor to child abuse. And past studies show that heavy drug-users are twice as likely to be high school drop-outs than those who do not use drugs.

So, Mr. President, we must ask ourselves: What can we do to jump-start the fight against drugs?

For starters, we must restore the stigma associated with illegal drug use.

Those of us in positions of authority—whether it is parents or teachers, religious leaders or those who hold elective office—must be willing to repeat over and over again the simple message that using drugs is wrong and that drugs can and do kill.

This message has worked before. It was called the Just Say No campaign. Illegal drug use declined dramatically throughout the 1980's and early 1990's in large part because our culture stigmatized drugs and shamed those who used them. This message got through to millions of teenagers and saved thousands of lives in the process.

Perhaps one of the best kept secrets is that, between 1980 and 1992, overall drug use declined by 50 percent. Cocaine use dropped even further—by more than 70 percent. These successes were the result of many factors, but perhaps the most important factor was the steady antidrug message that came out of Washington and through the media.

As Jim Burke, chairman of the Partnership for Drug-Free America, has explained: “Looking back at the progress made in changing attitudes in the 80's, it is very clear that the media played a very important role in shaping children's antidrug attitudes. We need them now to again increase their role in that regard.” I agree.

So, Mr. President, I rise today to do my own part, to help raise public awareness about the disturbing increases in teenage drug use. We must say “enough is enough.” Our children must understand that using drugs is

not only stupid but life-threatening. This is a message that can never be repeated too often.

LEGISLATION ON LATE-TERM ABORTIONS

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I want to follow up on the remarks of the majority leader in which he stated that next week we will be taking up the ban on late-term abortions. The point I want to make, because he referred to President Clinton, is in a press release that was sent out by the White House. It is true that the House did vote yesterday to ban late-term abortions. Unfortunately, they did not allow any amendments to the bill. And the bill makes no exceptions for life of the mother, for serious health risks to the mother, or for cases of severe fetal abnormalities, such cases where there is such serious abnormalities that organs are outside of the body.

The House did not want to have any reasonable amendments on that bill. It is a very radical bill, and the President restated his long-held belief that though he does not want to see abortions, he wants them to be legal and rare. But the fact is, in a late-term abortion, you must consider the life and the health of the mother.

I feel it is very important that when this bill comes to the U.S. Senate, we have an opportunity to know what we are doing. For the first time, the House has made abortion a criminal act. They would put a doctor in jail, even if the doctor acted to save the life of a woman. Now, surely, we need to study that.

Surely, we should have some hearings in our Judiciary Committee, where we can bring forward the doctors, where we can bring forward the women who have gone through this hellish experience. The House makes up a whole new term for these kinds of abortions. It is not a scientific term. They made it up. I, for one, was not elected to be a doctor. I have great respect for doctors. Many doctors oppose what the House did. I certainly was not elected to be God. I do not know how Senators feel, but, for a moment, I would like them to think about if their loving wife came home to them and said: We have a horrific situation. If I carry this pregnancy to term, I am going to die. I really think there are colleagues on the floor here that never think about this in personal terms.

In the House, they did not allow people to vote a moderate approach to this issue. I think that is a grave injustice to women in this country, to families in this country, to doctors in this country, to common sense in this country. Frankly, it was a grave injustice to the Members of the House, who had no opportunity to vote a moderate vote.

Life of the mother. Oh, they say in that bill a doctor could use it as a defense. He could go in front of a jury and